

REMARKS

The Examiner rejected claims 29-31 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly lacking patentable utility. Applicants respectfully maintain that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101 is moot in light of the amendment herein.

The Examiner rejected claims 29-31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Gundewar et al. (US Patent 6,381,610) in view of Examiner's Official Notice.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) with the following arguments.

35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 29-31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Gundewar et al. (US Patent 6,381,610) in view of Examiner's Official Notice.

The Examiner argues: "Gundewar et al. discloses the claimed device but does not explicitly claim "buttons" for selecting tasks of categories. Examiner takes official notice that selection buttons are notoriously old and well known in the art of computer operating systems (such as used in a Window's interface) in order to make it easy for a user to select an item from a list. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the program storage device of Gundewar et al.... Gundewar et al. discloses a program storage device readable by a machine, tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by a machine to perform method steps for coordinating a project for designing, implementing, and using a general procurement and accounts payable system for a customer, the method comprising: maintaining a playbook database (such as database containing project, task, template and guideline data); and displaying a playbook summary view with folders and views section (such as access to project, 100), a task title display and selection area (such as when the system displays project task selection window, 110), a summary task creation selection with display (such as when prompted to select a template, 180), and a detailed task creation button with display (such as when prompted to select the display guidelines 195)."

Applicants respectfully contend that claim 29 is not unpatentable over Gundewar in view of Examiner's Official Notice, because Gundewar in view of Examiner's Official Notice does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 29.

As a first example of why Gundewar in view of Examiner's Official Notice does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 29, Gundewar in view of Examiner's Official Notice does not teach or suggest the "GP/AP system" aspect of the feature "said playbook database comprising a plurality of templates of information relating to said designing, implementing, and using said **GP/AP system**" (emphasis added). Gundewar does not teach or suggest using his disclosed templates in conjunction with a GP/AP system.

As a second example of why Gundewar in view of Examiner's Official Notice does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 29, Gundewar in view of Examiner's Official Notice does not teach or suggest the "implementing, and using" aspect of the feature "said playbook database comprising a plurality of templates of information relating to said designing, **implementing, and using** said GP/AP system" (emphasis added). Gundewar's disclosure is restricted to templates for "planning" aspects of a project. Gundewar does not teach or suggest templates for "implementing, and using" aspects of a project. All of the templates discussed and disclosed by Gundewar relate to project planning, and none of the templates discussed and disclosed by Gundewar relate to "implementing, and using" aspects of a project. For example, see col. 4, lines 38-41: "The project task template includes a list of major project tasks that may be associated with Project X and that are organized according to various stages of **project planning**." (emphasis added).

As a third example of why Gundewar in view of Examiner's Official Notice does not

teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 29, Gundewar in view of Examiner's Official Notice does not teach or suggest the feature: "said plurality of templates being particularized for the **customer**" (emphasis added). Applicants contend that Gundewar's templates are particularized for a project, and Gundewar does not teach or suggest that the templates are particularized for a customer.

As a fourth example of why Gundewar in view of Examiner's Official Notice does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 29, Gundewar in view of Examiner's Official Notice does not teach or suggest the feature: "displaying a playbook summary **view**, said playbook summary **view** comprising a folders and views section, a task title display and selection area, a summary task creation button, and a detailed task creation button" (emphasis added). What the Examiner alleges to be a folders and views section, a task title display and selection area, a summary task creation button, and a detailed task creation button is not disclosed by Gundewar as sections or portions of a view as required by claim 29, but rather is disclosed as appearing in separate and distinct windows or views in violation of said requirement of claim 29. For example, the Examiner alleges that step 100 of FIG. 4 of Gundewar discloses a folders and views section of the "view". The Examiner alleges that step 110 of FIG. 4 of Gundewar discloses task title display and selection area, but Gundewar does not teach or suggest in col. 8, lines 21-23 that the alleged task title display and selection area of step 110 is displayed in the same view as is the task title display and selection area of step 100, as required by claim 29. The Examiner alleges that a prompt to select a template in step 180 of FIG. 4 of Gundewar discloses a summary task selection (which the Examiner alleges may be obviously in the form of a button), but Gundewar states in

col. 8, lines 39-42 that the template in step 180 is selected from a displayed procedure data sheet and not from the view which displays the folders and views section and the task title display and selection area, as required by claim 29. The Examiner alleges that a prompt to select guidelines in step 195 of FIG. 4 of Gundewar discloses a detailed task selection (which the Examiner alleges may be obviously in the form of a button), but Gundewar in col. 8, lines 44-46 states that the template in step 195 results from selection of a template from the displayed procedure data sheet and not from the view which displays the folders and views section and the task title display and selection area, as required by claim 29.

As a fifth example of why Gundewar in view of Examiner's Official Notice does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 29, Gundewar in view of Examiner's Official Notice does not teach or suggest the feature: "said folders and views section including category buttons relating to categories of tasks associated with said designing, implementing, and using said GP/AP system". The Examiner alleges that step 100 of FIG. 4 of Gundewar discloses a folders and views section, but all that Gundewar discloses in col. 8, lines 15-21 for step 100 is that a user may access a particular project. Thus step 100 presents a view of selectable projects, but does not present a view of selectable categories of tasks, as required by claim 29.

As a sixth example of why Gundewar in view of Examiner's Official Notice does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 29, Gundewar in view of Examiner's Official Notice does not teach or suggest the feature: "displaying a **summary task template** of the plurality of templates for a selected first task of the tasks identified in the task title display and

selection area, said summary task template being displayed in response to a selection of the summary task creation button, said summary task template including summary parameters of the selected first task” (emphasis added). The Examiner alleges that a prompt to select a template in step 180 of FIG. 4 of Gundewar discloses a summary task creation selection (which the Examiner alleges may be obviously in the form of a button). However, claim 29 requires more specificity than mere displaying of a template. Claim 29 recites “displaying a **summary** task template”, and in col. 8, lines 39-42 Gundewar states only that a template is selected from the procedure data sheet and subsequently displayed. Gundewar does not disclose that a **summary** template is selected from the procedure data sheet and subsequently displayed, as required by claim 29.

As a seventh example of why Gundewar in view of Examiner’s Official Notice does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 29, Gundewar in view of Examiner’s Official Notice does not teach or suggest the feature: “displaying a **detailed task template** of the plurality of templates for a selected second task of the tasks identified in the task title display and selection area, said detailed task template being displayed in response to a selection of the detailed task creation button, said detailed task template including detailed parameters of the selected second task” (emphasis added). The Examiner alleges that a prompt to select a guidelines in step 195 of FIG. 4 of Gundewar discloses a detailed task selection (which the Examiner alleges may be obviously in the form of a button). However, claim 29 requires that a detailed task template be displayed, and in col. 8, lines 44-46 Gundewar states only that guidelines are presented to the user as a result selecting a “particular template”, but does not disclose displaying a **detailed** task template, as required by claim 29.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that claim 29 is not unpatentable over Gundewar in view of Examiner's Official Notice, and that claim 29 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 30-40 depend from claim 29, Applicants contend that claims 30-40 are likewise in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invites the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Date: 02/03/2004

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
3 Lear Jet Lane, Suite 201
Latham, New York 12110
(518) 220-1850

Jack P. Friedman
Jack P. Friedman
Registration No. 44,688